

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 6 for more appropriately expressing the subject matter and to clear up other informalities. In addition, applicant has added new claim 13. No new matter is added by this amendment. Claims 1-13 remain pending in the present application. Applicant highly appreciates Examiner's careful review of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al. (US 6,041,310, hereinafter Green) in view of Brockman et al. (US 6,125,356, hereinafter Brockman).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 1-12 and allowance of claims 1-13. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections as understood.

With regard to claims 1-5:

Amended claim 1, recites in part:

‘the replication manager comprises **a first data filter module, which is used to filter information added in the database server, and to modify existing information in the database server and the mobile terminals;**
and
the domain manager is used to **manage domains;**’

Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above-highlighted features, as set forth in amended claim 1.

Green teaches a data server that is adapted to route a customer query from an input/display terminal to a storage device; to create a customer query containing parameters relating to a preferred automobile in a kiosk processor; to execute the

customer query and create a selected inventory by determining whether a predetermined minimum number of inventory items meet the parameters and adding at least one additional item outside the parameters if fewer than the minimum number exist in a current inventory; and to display the selected inventory at the input/display terminal (see the Abstract, the claims, col. 5, lines 27-37 and col. 6, lines 37-53).

Applicant acknowledges that the data server of Green corresponds to **the application server** of amended claim 1, and is installed with one or more functional programs for facilitating an automobile transaction between a customer and an automobile dealership. However, Green does not teach or suggest that the data server has a function for **filtering information**, a function for **modifying existing information**, and a function for **managing domains**. The present claim 1 recites that “the application server” comprises *the first data filter module used to filter information added in the database server, and used to modify existing information in the database server and the mobile terminals*, and comprises *the domain manager used to manage domains*. That is, Green fails to teach or suggest the features of “the replication manager comprises **a first data filter module, which is used to filter information added in the database server, and to modify existing information in the database server and the mobile terminals**” and “the domain manager is used to **manage domains**,” as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application.

Furthermore, amended claim 1, recites in part:

‘the link-switching module is used for **switching connection states as between the mobile terminal and the application server**, said connection states comprising a connected state and a disconnected state;’ and

‘the second data filter module is used for **filtering modification of data stored in the data storage, said modification performed when the mobile terminal is in the disconnected state**, and for sending data thus modified to the data synchronization module.’

Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above-highlighted features, as set forth in amended claim 1.

Green teaches an input/display terminal that is adapted to form a multilevel customer query and to display responses thereto, the terminal including a terminal processor, wherein the terminal processor is adapted to create a link between a customer and a salesperson assigned to the customer (see the Abstract, the claims, col. 5, lines 27-37, and col. 6, lines 37-53).

Applicant acknowledges that the input/display terminal of Green corresponds to **each of the mobile terminals** of amended claim 1, and is installed with one or more functional programs for facilitating an automobile transaction for a customer. However, Green does not teach or suggest that the input/display terminal has a function of **switching connection states between two devices** and has a function of **filtering modification of data**. The present claim 1 recites that “each of the mobile terminals” comprises the link-switching module used for **switching connection states as between the mobile terminal and the application server**, and comprises the second data filter module used for **filtering modification of data stored in the data storage**. That is, Green fails to teach or suggest the features of “the link-switching module is used for **switching connection states as between the mobile terminal and the application server**, said connection states comprising a connected state and a disconnected state” and “the second data filter module is used for **filtering modification of data stored in the data storage, said modification performed when the mobile terminal is in the disconnected state**, and for sending data thus modified to the data synchronization module,” as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application.

In addition, amended claim 1, recites in part:

‘the budget module is used for **calculating payable fees relating to vehicles within the purview of a client by using one or more preset formulas** stored in the data storage, **and for generating one or more budget plans in a table form.**’

Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above-highlighted features, as set forth in amended claim 1.

Green teaches that a method and system for facilitating a transaction between a customer and an automobile dealership. The system includes a kiosk including an input/display terminal and a terminal processor for formulating a multilevel customer query of automobile inventory. The multilevel customer query searches a storage device containing automobile data and images and returns a selected inventory to the input/display terminal. The method includes a step of accessing customer data, customer queries and the selected inventory via a data server from a financing and insurance application to determine exact monthly payments for the lease/purchase of an automobile from the selected inventory (abstract and claims and col. 5, lines 27-37, col. 6, lines 37-53).

According to these disclosures of Green, the monthly payments, including financing and insurance fees, for the lease/purchase of an automobile can be determined. Applicant acknowledges that the monthly payments of Green corresponds to **payable fees** of amended claim 1. However, the presently claimed “**budget module**,” in amended claim 1, can calculate payable fees relating to vehicles within the purview of a client, *by using one or more preset formulas*. Green does not teach or suggest how to determine the monthly payments (**payable fees**). Green discloses that the monthly payments (**payable fees**) should be manually determined by searching the selected inventory information. The presently claimed “**budget module**,” in amended claim 1, can generate **one or more budget plans**. The “**one or more budget plans**” feature is disclosed in, at least paragraph [0042], the originally filed specification, and is not taught or suggested by Green. That is, the feature of “**budget module**” of amended claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Green. Green fails to teach or suggest the feature of “the budget module is used for **calculating payable fees relating to vehicles within the purview of a client, by using one or more preset formulas** stored in the data storage, and for generating one or more budget plans in a table form,” as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application.

Applicant states that Brockman does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted limitations either. It is submitted that any combination of Green and Brockman does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted limitations either. For at least the above reasons, applicant asserts that the system for assisting in selling vehicles of claim 1 is distinctly and patentably different from any combination of Green and Brockman.

In conclusion, applicant asserts that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teach or otherwise suggest the present invention, having the above-highlighted limitations, as set forth in amended claim 1. Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of Brockman. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are requested.

Claims 2-5 depend from amended independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore claims 2-5 should also be allowable.

With regard to claims 6-11:

Claim 6, as amended, recites in part:

“using one or more preset formulas to calculate payable fees in relation to the vehicle, and displaying a budget plan result generated in a table form on the mobile terminal.”

Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above-highlighted features, as set forth in amended claim 1.

Claim 6 is a method claim corresponding to the system for assisting in selling vehicles of claim 1. Referring to and incorporating herein the above-stated reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, Applicant submits that for similar reasons, neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the present invention having the above-described features as set forth in amended claim 6. That is, amended claim 6 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over

Green in view of Brockman. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 6 are requested.

Since claims 7-11 depend from amended independent claim 6, and respectively recite additional subject matter, claims 7-11 should also now be allowable.

With regard to claim 12:

Claim 12 recites in part:

‘the replication manager comprises **a first data filter module, which is used to filter information added in the database server, and to modify existing information in the database server and the mobile terminals;** and

the domain manager is used to **manage domains;**’

‘the link-switching module is used for **switching connection states as between the mobile terminal and the application server**, said states of connection comprising a connected state and a disconnected state;’ and

‘the second data filter module is used for **filtering modification of data stored in the data storage, said modification performed when the mobile terminal is in the disconnected state**, and for sending data thus modified to the data synchronization module.’

Claim 12 is similar to the system for assisting in selling vehicles of claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of claim 1. Referring to and incorporating herein the above-stated reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, Applicant submits that for similar reasons, neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the present invention having the above-described features as set forth in claim 12. That is, claim 12 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of Brockman. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 6 are requested.

New Claim

New claim 13 depends directly from independent claim 12, which is asserted to be patentable over the cited reference (see above). Claim 13 is submitted to also represent patentable subject matter.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/643,819
Amdt. Dated Apr. 27, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed Feb. 12, 2008

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,

Chuang et al.

By /Frank R. Niranjana/ Date: April 27, 2008

Frank R. Niranjana

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649